arXiv:0801.3537v1 [math.LO] 23 Jan 2008

In this paper the Erdős-Rado theorem is generalized to the class of well founded trees. We define an equivalence relation on the class $\mathrm{ds}(\infty)^{<\aleph_0}$ (finite sequences of decreasing sequences of ordinals) with $\aleph_0$ equivalence classes, and for $n < \omega$ a notion of n-end-uniformity for a colouring of $\mathrm{ds}(\infty)^{<\aleph_0}$ with μ colours. We then show that for every ordinal α, $n < \omega$ and cardinal μ there is an ordinal λ so that for any colouring c of $T = \mathrm{ds}(\lambda)^{<\aleph_0}$ with μ colours, T contains S isomorphic to $\mathrm{ds}(\alpha)$ so that $c{\restriction}S^{<\aleph_0}$ is n-end uniform. For c with domain T^n this is equivalent to finding $S \subseteq T$ isomorphic to $\mathrm{ds}(\alpha)$ so that $c{\restriction}S^n$ depends only on the equivalence class of the defined relation, so in particular $T \rightarrow (\mathrm{ds}(\alpha))^n_{\mu,\aleph_0}$. We also draw a conclusion on colourings of n-tuples from a scattered linear order.

Combinatorics, Probability and Computing (2008) 00, 000–000. © 2008 Cambridge University Press
DOI: 10.1017/S0000000000000000 Printed in the United Kingdom

Uniforming n-place functions on $T \subseteq \mathrm{ds}(\alpha)$

E. GRUENHUT[1] and S. SHELAH[2†]

[1] Einstein Institute of Mathematics, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem,
Jerusalem 91904, Israel.
[2] Einstein Institute of Mathematics, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem,
Jerusalem 91904, Israel,
and Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University,
New Brunswick, NJ 08854, USA.

esth@math.huji.ac.il and shelah@math.huji.ac.i

This paper is a natural continuation of [3] in which Shelah and Komjáth prove that for any scattered order type φ and cardinal μ there exists a scattered order type ψ such that $\psi \to [\varphi]^n_{\mu,\aleph_0}$. This was proved by a theorem on colourings of well founded trees. By Hausdorff's characterization (see [2] and [4]) every scattered order type can be embedded in a well founded tree, so we can deduce a natural generalization of their theorem to the n-ary case, i.e for every scattered order type φ, $n < \omega$, and cardinal μ there is a scattered order type ψ such that $\psi \to (\varphi)^n_{\mu,\aleph_0}$.

We start with a few definitions.

Definition 0.1. *For an ordinal* α *we define* $\mathrm{ds}(\alpha) = \{\eta : \eta$ *a decreasing sequence of ordinals* $< \alpha\}$. *By* $\mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ *we mean the class of decreasing sequences of ordinals.*

We say $T \subseteq \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ is a tree when T is non-empty and closed under initial segments. T, S will denote trees. For $S \subseteq T \subseteq \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ we say that S is a subtree of T if it is also a tree. We use the following notation:

Notation 0.2.

1 *For* $\eta, \nu \in \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ *by* $\eta \cap \nu$ *we mean* $\eta{\restriction}\ell$ *where* ℓ *is maximal such that* $\eta{\restriction}\ell = \nu{\restriction}\ell$.

2 *For* $\eta \in \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ *and a tree* $T \subset \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ *we define*

$$\eta^\frown T = \{\rho : \rho \trianglelefteq \eta \vee (\exists \nu \in T)(\rho = \eta^\frown \nu)\}$$

[†] Research of both authors supported by the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation (Grant no. 2002323). Publication 909 in Shelah's archive.

Note that for $\eta \in \mathrm{ds}(\infty \backslash \{\langle\rangle\})$ and $\{\langle\rangle\} \subsetneq T \subseteq \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ if $\eta(\lg(\eta)-1) > \sup\{\rho(0) : \rho \in T\}$ then $\eta^\frown T \subseteq \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$.

Definition 0.3. *We define the following four binary relations on* $\mathrm{ds}(\infty)$*:*

1 *Let* $<^1_{\ell x}$ *be the two place relation on* $\mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ *defined by* $\eta <^1_{\ell x} \nu$ *iff one of the following:* $(\exists \ell)(\eta(\ell) < \nu(\ell)$ *or* $\eta{\restriction}\ell = \nu{\restriction}\ell)$ *or* $\eta \triangleleft \nu$.

2 *Let* $<^2_{\ell x}$ *be the two place relation on* $\mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ *defined by* $\eta <^2_{\ell x} \nu$ *iff one of the following:* $(\exists \ell)(\eta(\ell) < \nu(\ell)$ *or* $\eta{\restriction}\ell = \nu{\restriction}\ell)$ *or* $\nu \triangleleft \eta$.

3 $<^*_{\ell x} = <^1_{\ell x} \cap <^2_{\ell x}$.

4 *Let* $<^3$ *be the two place relation on* $\mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ *defined by* $\eta <^3 \nu$ *iff one of the following:* $\eta \triangleleft \nu$ *or for the maximal* ℓ *such that* $\eta{\restriction}\ell = \nu{\restriction}\ell$ *if* ℓ *is even then* $\eta(\ell) < \nu(\ell)$ *and if* ℓ *is odd then* $\eta(\ell) > \nu(\ell)$.

It is easily verified that $<^1_{\ell x}, <^2_{\ell x}$ and $<^3$ are complete orders of $\mathrm{ds}(\infty)$, and therefore $<^*_{\ell x}$ is a partial order. The following remark refers to their order types defined by $<^1_{\ell x}, <^2_{\ell x}$ and $<^3$ on $\mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ or $\mathrm{ds}(\alpha)$.

Observation 0.4.

1 $<^1_{\ell x}, <^2_{\ell x}$ *are well orderings for* $\mathrm{ds}(\infty)$.

2 $(\mathrm{ds}(\alpha), <^3)$ *is a scattered linear order type for every ordinal* α.

3 *Every scattered linear order type can be embedded in* $(\mathrm{ds}(\alpha), <^3)$ *for some ordinal* α.

Proof.

1 Let $\emptyset \neq A \subseteq \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$, we define by induction on $n < \omega$ an element a_n in the following manner $a_0 = \min\{\eta(0) : \eta \in A\}$, assume $a_0, \cdots, a_{n-1}$ have been chosen so that $\langle a_k : k < n\rangle \in \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ and for every $\eta \in A$ $\langle a_k : k < n\rangle \leq^2_{\ell x} \eta{\restriction}n$ (if $\lg(\eta) \leq n$ then $\eta{\restriction}n = \eta$). Now choose $a_n = \min\{\eta(n) : \eta \in A \wedge \eta{\restriction}n = \langle a_k : k < n\rangle\}$, if that set isn't empty. As the sequence derived in the above manner is a decreasing sequence of ordinals it is finite, say $a_0, \cdots a_{n-1}$ have been defined and a_n cannot be defined, we will show that $\bar{a} = \langle a_k : k < n\rangle$ is the minimal element of A with respect to $<^2_{\ell x}$. By the definition of the sequence there is an $\eta \in A$ so that $\eta{\restriction}n = \bar{a}$, if $\lg(\eta) > n$ then we could have defined a_n, so $\eta = \bar{a}$ and in particular $\bar{a} \in A$, and for every $\eta \in A \backslash \{\bar{a}\}$ we have $\bar{a} <^2_{\ell x} \eta$. Let $n_* = \min\{m : \bar{a}{\restriction}m \in A\}$ so $\bar{a}{\restriction}n_*$ is the minimal $<^1_{\ell x}$ element in A.

2 The proof is by induction on α. Assume that $(\mathrm{ds}(\beta), <^3)$ is a scattered linear order type for every $\beta < \alpha$, and assume towards contradiction that $\mathbb{Q}$ can be embedded in $(\mathrm{ds}(\alpha), <^3)$, $q \mapsto \eta_q$. Let $C = \{\ell : (\exists p, q \in \mathbb{Q})(\eta_p(\ell) \neq \eta_q(\ell))\}$, $\ell = \min C$ and $\Gamma = \{\beta : (\exists q \in \mathbb{Q})(\eta_q(\ell) = \beta)\}$. Without loss of generality ℓ is even and for $\beta_0 = \min \Gamma$, $\beta_1 = \min \Gamma \backslash \{\beta_0\}$ there are $q_0 < q_1 \in \mathbb{Q}$ so that $\eta_{q_i}(\ell) = \beta_i$, $i = 0, 1$. Now $(q_0, q_1) = B_0 \cup B_1$ where $B_i = \{p \in (q_0, q_1) : \eta_p(\ell) = \beta_i\}$. For some $i \in \{0, 1\}$ the set B_i contains an interval of $\mathbb{Q}$ and is embedded in $(\eta_{q_i}{\restriction}(\ell+1)^\frown \mathrm{ds}(\beta_i), <^3)$ but this would imply that $\mathbb{Q}$ can be embedded in $(\mathrm{ds}(\beta_i), <^3)$ which is a contradiction to the induction hypothesis.

3 By Hausdorff's characterization it is enough to show for ordinals α and β that both

$A_{\alpha,\beta} = (\mathrm{ds}(\alpha), <^3) \times \beta$ and $A_{\alpha,\beta^*} = (\mathrm{ds}(\alpha), <^3) \times \beta^*$ can be embedded in $(\mathrm{ds}(\alpha + \beta \cdot 2 + 1), <^3)$. The embedding is given as follows, for $(\eta, \gamma) \in A_{\alpha,\beta}$ we have $(\eta, \gamma) \mapsto \langle \alpha+\beta+\gamma+1, \alpha+\beta\rangle^\frown\eta$, and for $(\eta, \gamma) \in A_{\alpha,\beta^*}$ we have $(\eta, \gamma) \mapsto \langle \alpha+\beta\cdot 2, \alpha+\beta+\gamma\rangle^\frown\eta$.

$\square$

Definition 0.5. *For trees $T_1, T_2 \subset \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$, $f : T_1 \to T_2$ is an embedding of T_1 into T_2 if f preserves level, $\lhd$ and $<^1_{\ell x}$ (or equivalently, $<^2_{\ell x}, <^*_{\ell x}$ or $<^3$).*

Observation 0.6. *For trees $T_1, T_2 \subset \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$, if $f : T_1 \to T_2$ preserves level and $\lhd$ then in order to determine whether f is an embedding it is enough to check for $\eta \in T_1$ and ordinals $\gamma_1 < \gamma_2$ such that $\nu_i = \eta^\frown\langle\gamma_i\rangle \in T_1$ $(i = 1, 2)$ that $f(\nu_1) <^*_{\ell x} f(\nu_2)$.*

As $T \subseteq \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ is well founded, i.e there are no infinite branches, it is natural to define a rank function. in the following definition $\mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}$ isn't the standard rank function but for $\mu = 1$ we get a similar definition to the usual definition of a rank on a well founded tree.

Definition 0.7. *For a tree $T \subset \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ and cardinal μ define $\mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta) : \mathrm{ds}(\infty) \to \{-1\} \cup \mathrm{Ord}$ by induction on α as follows:*

(a) $\mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta) \geq 0$ *iff* $\eta \in T$.
(b) $\mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta) \geq \alpha + 1$ *iff* $\mu \leq |\{\gamma : \eta^\frown\langle\gamma\rangle \in T \wedge \mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta^\frown\langle\gamma\rangle) \geq \alpha\}|$.
(c) $\mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta) \geq \delta$ *limit iff* $(\forall\alpha < \delta)(\mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta) \geq \alpha)$.

We say that $\mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta) = \alpha$ *iff* $\mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta) \geq \alpha$ *but* $\mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta) \ngeq \alpha + 1$.
Denote $\mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(T) = \mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\langle\rangle)$, *and* $\mathrm{rk}_T(\eta) = \mathrm{rk}_{T,1}(\eta)$.

Definition 0.8. *For a tree $T \subset \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$, $\eta \in T$ and cardinals μ, λ we define the reduced rank $\mathrm{rk}^\lambda_{T,\mu}(\eta) = \min\{\lambda, \mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta)\}$.*

We first note a few properties of the rank function.

Observation 0.9. *For $\eta \in T \subset \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ and an ordinal α we have:*

1 *For cardinals $\mu \leq \mu'$ we have $\mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta) \geq \mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu'}(\eta)$, and in particular $\mathrm{rk}_T(\eta) \geq \mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta)$*
2 $\mathrm{rk}_T(\eta) = \cup\{\mathrm{rk}_T(\eta^\frown\langle\gamma\rangle) + 1 : \eta^\frown\langle\gamma\rangle \in T\}$.
3 $\mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{ds}(\alpha)}(\langle\rangle) = \alpha$.
4 *If* $\mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta) \geq \alpha$, $\mu \geq \alpha$ *then we can embed $\eta^\frown\mathrm{ds}(\alpha)$ into T, so that $\rho \mapsto \rho$ for $\rho \trianglelefteq \eta$.*

Proof.

3 The proof is by induction on α.
For $\alpha = 0$ this is obvious. Assume correctness for every $\beta < \alpha$. $\mathrm{ds}(\alpha) = \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} \{\langle\beta\rangle^\frown\nu : \nu \in \mathrm{ds}(\beta)\}$. For every $\beta < \alpha, \nu \in \mathrm{ds}(\beta)$ we have $\mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{ds}(\alpha)}(\langle\beta\rangle^\frown\nu) = \mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{ds}(\beta)}(\nu)$, therefore (the last equality is due to the induction hypothesis):

$$\begin{aligned}\cup\{\mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{ds}(\alpha)}(\langle\beta\rangle^\frown\nu)+1:\nu\in\mathrm{ds}(\beta)\} &= \cup\{\mathrm{rk}_{\mathrm{ds}(\beta)}(\nu)+1:\nu\in\mathrm{ds}(\beta)\}\\ &= \mathrm{rk}(\mathrm{ds}(\beta))\\ &= \beta\end{aligned}$$

We therefore have $\mathrm{rk}(\mathrm{ds}(\alpha)) = \cup\{\beta+1:\beta<\alpha\} = \alpha$

4 The proof is by induction on α.

For $\alpha = 0$ there is nothing to prove.

Assume correctness for every $\beta < \alpha$, and $\mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta) \geq \alpha$, $\alpha \leq \mu$. For $\beta < \alpha$ let $C_\beta = \{\gamma : \mathrm{rk}_{T,\mu}(\eta^\frown\langle\gamma\rangle) \geq \beta\}$, so $|C_\beta| \geq \mu$ and $C_\beta \subseteq C_{\beta'}$ for $\beta' < \beta < \alpha$. By induction on $\beta < \alpha$ we can choose an increasing sequence of ordinals γ_β such that $\gamma_\beta = \min\Gamma_\beta$ where $\Gamma_\beta = \{\gamma \in C_\beta : (\forall\beta' < \beta)(\gamma > \gamma_{\beta'})\}$. Assume towards contradiction that Γ_β is empty, and let $C'_\beta = \langle\gamma_{\beta'} : \beta' < \beta\rangle \cap C_\beta$. For every $\gamma \in C_\beta \backslash C'_\beta$ (and there is such γ as $|C_\beta| \geq \mu$ whereas $|C'_\beta| \leq |\beta| < \mu$) as $\gamma \notin \Gamma_\beta$ then there is $\beta' < \beta$ such that $\gamma < \gamma_{\beta'}$, assume β' is minimal with this property, but that contradicts the choice of $\gamma_{\beta'}$.

By the induction hypothesis for every $\beta < \alpha$ there is φ_β which embeds $(\eta^\frown\langle\gamma_\beta\rangle)^\frown\mathrm{ds}(\beta)$ in T so that $\varphi_\beta\restriction\{\rho : \rho \trianglelefteq \eta^\frown\langle\gamma_\beta\rangle\} = Id$. We now define $\varphi_\alpha : \eta^\frown\mathrm{ds}(\alpha) \to T$ in the following manner, if $\rho \trianglelefteq \eta$ then $\varphi_\alpha(\rho) = \rho$, else $\rho = \eta^\frown\nu$ for some $\nu \in \mathrm{ds}(\alpha)$, so there is $\beta < \alpha$ such that $\nu = \langle\beta\rangle^\frown\nu_1$ with $\nu_1 \in \mathrm{ds}(\beta)$, and we define

$$\varphi_\alpha(\rho) = \varphi_\beta(\eta^\frown\langle\gamma_\beta\rangle^\frown\nu_1).$$

φ_α obviously preserves level.

For $\rho_1 \triangleleft \rho_2$ in $\eta^\frown\mathrm{ds}(\alpha)$ if $\rho_1 \trianglelefteq \eta$ then obviously $\varphi_\alpha(\rho_1) \triangleleft \varphi_\alpha(\rho_2)$, and otherwise for some $\beta < \alpha$ we have $\rho_i = \eta^\frown\langle\beta\rangle^\frown\nu_i$, $i \in \{1,2\}$, $\nu_1 \triangleleft \nu_2 \in \mathrm{ds}(\beta)$, and as φ_β is an embedding we have:

$$\varphi_\alpha(\rho_1) = \varphi_\beta(\eta^\frown\langle\gamma_\beta\rangle^\frown\nu_1) \triangleleft \varphi_\beta(\eta^\frown\langle\gamma_\beta\rangle^\frown\nu_2) = \varphi_\alpha(\rho_2).$$

For $\rho \in \eta^\frown\mathrm{ds}(\alpha)$, $\gamma_1 < \gamma_2$ ordinals such that for $i = 1,2$ $\rho_i = \rho^\frown\langle\gamma_i\rangle \in \eta^\frown\mathrm{ds}(\alpha)$, necessarily $\eta \trianglelefteq \rho$ and there are $\beta_1 \leq \beta_2 < \alpha$, $\nu_i \in \mathrm{ds}(\beta_i)$ so that $\rho_i = \eta^\frown\langle\beta_i\rangle^\frown\nu_i$. If $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta$ then $\nu_1 <^*_{\ell x} \nu_2$, and as φ_β is an embedding,

$$\varphi_\alpha(\rho_1) = \varphi_\beta(\eta^\frown\langle\gamma_\beta\rangle^\frown\nu_1) <^*_{\ell x} \varphi_\beta(\eta^\frown\langle\gamma_\beta\rangle^\frown\nu_2) = \varphi_\alpha(\rho_2)$$

On the other hand, if $\beta_1 \neq \beta_2$ then $\varphi_\alpha(\rho_i)(\lg(\eta)) = \gamma_{\beta_i}$, and as $\gamma_{\beta_1} < \gamma_{\beta_2}$, also in this case $\varphi_\alpha(\rho_1) <^*_{\ell x} \varphi_\alpha(\rho_2)$.

By Observation 0.6 φ_α is an embedding, and by definition $\varphi_\alpha\restriction\{\rho : \rho \trianglelefteq \eta\} = Id$.

□

The following theorem was was proved By Komjáth and Shelah in [3]:

Theorem 0.10. *Assume α is an ordinal and μ a cardinal. Set $\lambda = (|\alpha|^{\mu^{\aleph_0}})^+$, and let $F : \mathrm{ds}(\lambda^+) \to \mu$. Then there is an embedding $\varphi : \mathrm{ds}(\alpha) \to \mathrm{ds}(\lambda^+)$ and a function $c : \omega \to \mu$ such that for every $\eta \in \mathrm{ds}(\alpha)$ of length $n+1$*

$$F(\varphi(\eta)) = c(n).$$

In what follows we will generalize the above theorem, in the process we will use infinitary logics. For the readers convenience we include the following definitions.

Definition 0.11.

1 *For infinite cardinals* κ, λ, *and a vocabulary* τ *consisting of a list of relation and function symbols and their 'arity' which is finite, the infinitary language* $\mathbb{L}_{\kappa,\lambda}$ *for* τ *is defined in a similar manner to first order logic. The first subscript,* κ, *indicates that formulas have* $< \kappa$ *free variables and that we can join together* $< \kappa$ *formulas by* $\bigwedge$ *or* $\bigvee$, *the second subscript,* λ, *indicates that we can put* $< \lambda$ *quantifiers together in a row.*

2 *Given a structure* $\mathfrak{B}$ *for* τ *we say that* $\mathfrak{A}$ *is an* $\mathbb{L}_{\kappa,\lambda}$*-elementary submodel (or substructure), and denote* $\mathfrak{A} \prec_{\kappa,\lambda} \mathfrak{B}$ *or* $\mathfrak{A} \prec_{\mathbb{L}_{\kappa,\lambda}} \mathfrak{B}$, *if* $\mathfrak{A}$ *is a substructure of* $\mathfrak{B}$ *in the regular manner, and for any* $\mathbb{L}_{\kappa,\lambda}$ *formula* φ *with* γ *free variables and* $\bar{a} \in {}^{\gamma}|\mathfrak{A}|$ *we have*

$$\mathfrak{B} \models \varphi(\bar{a}) \Leftrightarrow \mathfrak{A} \models \varphi(\bar{a}).$$

The Tarski-Vought condition for a substructure $\mathfrak{A}$ *of* $\mathfrak{B}$ *to be an elementary submodel is that for any* $\mathbb{L}_{\kappa,\lambda}$*-formula* φ *with parameters* $\bar{a} \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$ *we have*

$$\mathfrak{B} \models \exists \bar{x} \varphi(\bar{x}\bar{a}) \Rightarrow \mathfrak{A} \models \exists \bar{x} \varphi(\bar{x}\bar{a}).$$

3 *A set* X *is transitive if for every* $x \in X$ *we have* $x \subseteq X$.

4 *For every set* X *there exists a minimal transitive set, which is denoted by* $TC(X)$, *such that* $X \subseteq TC(X)$.

5 *For an infinite regular cardinal* κ *we define*

$$\mathcal{H}(\kappa) = \{X : |TC(X)| < \kappa\}.$$

Remark 0.12. *In this paper the main use of infinitary logic will be in the following manner:*

1 τ *will consist of the two binary relations* $\in$ *and* $<^*$, *so* $|\mathbb{L}_{\kappa^+,\kappa^+}(\tau)| = 2^\kappa$.

2 *If* $\kappa' \leq \kappa$, $\lambda' \leq \lambda$ *and* $\mathfrak{A} \prec_{\kappa,\lambda} \mathfrak{B}$ *then also* $\mathfrak{A} \prec_{\kappa',\lambda'} \mathfrak{B}$.

3 $\prec_{\kappa,\lambda}$ *is a transitive relation.*

4 *For an infinite cardinal* μ *let* $\kappa = \mu^+$, $\lambda = 2^\mu$, *so* κ *is regular and* $\lambda^{<\kappa} = \lambda$. *Recall that for a structure* $\mathfrak{B}$ *and* $X \subseteq \|\mathfrak{B}\|$ *such that* $|X| + \tau \leq \lambda \leq \mathfrak{B}$ *there is an elementary* $\mathbb{L}_{\kappa,\kappa}$ *submodel* $\mathfrak{A}$ *of* $\mathfrak{B}$ *of cardinality* λ *which includes* X.
For further reference on this point see [1].

5 *If* $\mathfrak{A} \prec_{\kappa,\kappa} \mathfrak{B}$ *and* x *is definable in* $\mathfrak{B}$ *over* $\mathfrak{A}$ *(i.e with parameters in* $\mathfrak{A}$*) by an* $\mathbb{L}_{\kappa,\kappa}$*-formula, then it is also definable in* $\mathfrak{A}$ *by the same formula. In particular if* $\mathfrak{A} \prec_{\kappa,\kappa} \mathfrak{B}$ *and* $X \subseteq |\mathfrak{A}|, |X| < \kappa$ *then* $X \in |\mathfrak{A}|$.

Definition 0.13. *We say two finite sequence* $\langle \eta_\ell : \ell < n \rangle, \langle \nu_\ell : \ell < n \rangle$ *are* *similar* *when:*

(a) $\lg(\eta_\ell) = \lg(\nu_\ell)$ *for* $\ell < n$.

(b) $\lg(\eta_\ell \cap \eta_m) = \lg(\nu_\ell \cap \nu_m)$ *for* $\ell, m < n$.

(c) $(\eta_\ell <^2_{\ell x} \eta_m) \equiv (\nu_\ell <^2_{\ell x} \nu_m)$ *for* $\ell, m < n$ *(equivalently, we could use* $<^1_{\ell x}$*).*

Observation 0.14.

1 *Similarity is an equivalence relation and the number of equivalence classes of finite sequences is* $\aleph_0$*.*

2 $\langle \eta_1, \ldots, \eta_k, \nu' \rangle$, $\langle \eta_1, \ldots, \eta_k, \nu'' \rangle$ *are similar if*

  (a) $\eta_1 <^2_{\ell x} \eta_2 <^2_{\ell x} \ldots <^2_{\ell x} \eta_k$

  (b) $\eta_k <^2_{\ell x} \nu'$

  (c) $\eta_k <^2_{\ell x} \nu''$

  (d) $\lg(\nu') = \lg(\nu'')$

  (e) $\lg(\nu' \cap \eta_k) = \lg(\nu'' \cap \eta_k)$

Proof.

1 Similarity is obviously an equivalence relation.
The equivalence class of a finite sequence of $\mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ is determined by its length n, the lengths $\langle n_i : i < n \rangle$ of its elements, the lengths $\langle n_{i,j} : i, j < n \rangle$ of their intersections, and a permutation of n (the order of the elements according to $<^1_{\ell x}$). Therefore for each $n < \omega$ there are $\aleph_0$ equivalence classes of sequences of length n, and so the number of equivalence classes of finite sequences of $\mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ is $\aleph_0$.

2 We need to show that $\lg(\nu' \cap \eta_i) = \lg(\nu'' \cap \eta_i)$ for every $0 < i < k$.
$\eta_k <^2_{\ell x} \nu'$ and $\eta_k <^2_{\ell x} \nu''$. If $\nu' \triangleleft \eta_k$ then we also have $\lg(\nu'' \cap \eta_k) = \lg(\nu' \cap \eta_k) = \lg(\nu') = \lg(\nu'')$ so $\nu'' \triangleleft \eta_k$, and $\nu' = \nu''$. In this case obviously the required sequences are similar, so we can assume that there is ℓ such that $\eta_k \restriction \ell = \nu' \restriction \ell$ and $\nu'(\ell) > \eta_k(\ell)$. By the same reasoning as above we deduce that $\eta_k \restriction \ell = \nu'' \restriction \ell$ and $\nu''(\ell) \neq \eta_k(\ell)$ so necessarily $\nu''(\ell) > \eta_k(\ell)$.

$\square$

The last term we will need before moving on to the main theorem is that of uniformity.

Definition 0.15. *Let $T \subseteq \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ be a tree, $c : [T]^{<\aleph_0} \to C$. We identify $u \in [T]^{<\aleph_0}$ with the $<^2_{\ell x}$-increasing sequence listing it.*

1 *We say T is c-uniform if for any similar u_1, u_2 in $[T]^{<\aleph_0}$ we have $c(u_1) = c(u_2)$.*

2 *We say T is c-end-uniform (or end-uniform for c) when*
if $\eta_1 <^2_{\ell x} \eta_2 <^2_{\ell x} \ldots <^2_{\ell x} \eta_k <^2_{\ell x} \rho', \rho''$ are in T and $\lg(\rho') = \lg(\rho''), \lg(\eta_k \cap \rho') = \lg(\eta_k \cap \rho'')$ (equivalently $\langle \eta_1 \ldots \eta_k, \rho' \rangle, \langle \eta_1 \ldots \eta_k, \rho'' \rangle$ are similar-see 0.4(3))
then $c(\langle \eta_1 \ldots \eta_k, \rho' \rangle) = c(\langle \eta_1, \ldots, \eta_k, \rho'' \rangle)$.

3 *We say T is c-n-end-uniform (or n-end-uniform for c) when for $k < \omega$, $\eta_i, \rho'_j, \rho''_j \in \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ $(0 < i \leq k, 0 < j \leq n)$ such that*

$$\eta_1 <^2_{\ell x} < \eta_2 <^2_{\ell x} \ldots <^2_{\ell x} \eta_k <^2_{\ell x} \rho'_1 <^2_{\ell x} \ldots <^2_{\ell x} \rho'_n$$

$$\eta_1 <^2_{\ell x} < \eta_2 <^2_{\ell x} \ldots <^2_{\ell x} \eta_k <^2_{\ell x} \rho''_1 <^2_{\ell x} < \ldots < \rho''_n$$

if those two sequences are similar then

$$c(\langle \eta_1 \ldots, \rho'_1 \ldots \rangle) = c(\langle \eta_1 \ldots \rho''_1 \ldots \rangle).$$

We are now ready for the main theorem of this paper.

Main Claim 0.16. *Given a tree* $S \subseteq \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ *and a cardinal* μ *we can find a tree* $T \subseteq \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ *such that*

$(*)_1$ *for every* $c : [T]^{<\aleph_0} \to \mu$ *there is* $T' \subseteq T$ *isomorphic to* S *such that* $c \restriction T'$ *is c-end-uniform.*

$(*)_2$ $|T| < \beth_{|S|^+}(|S| + \mu)$.

Proof. We assume that $|S|, \mu$ are infinite cardinals since one of our main goals is proving a statement of the form $x \to [y]^n_{\mu,\aleph_0}$, otherwise the bound on T has to be slightly adjusted. For each $\eta \in S$ let

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha_\eta = \alpha_S(\eta) = \mathrm{otp}(\{\nu \in S : \nu <^2_{\ell x} \eta\}, <^2_{\ell x}), \\ &\mu_\eta = \beth_{5\alpha_\eta + 1}(|S| + \mu), \\ &\lambda_\eta = \beth_3(\mu_\eta)^+. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mu_{\langle\rangle}, \lambda_{\langle\rangle}$ are the maximal ones, and let $\chi >> \lambda_{<>}$, and $<^*_\chi$ be a well ordering of $\mathcal{H}(\chi)$ (see 0.11(5)). By definition, for every $\eta, \nu \in S$ such that $\eta <^2_{\ell x} \nu$ we have $\mu_\eta < \mu_\nu$, and $\lambda_\eta < \lambda_\nu$ in the following we examine the relation between μ_ν and λ_η for $\eta \neq \nu$.

Observation 0.17. *For* $\eta <^2_{\ell x} \nu$ *we have* $\mu_\nu \geq \lambda^+_\eta$.

Proof. Since $\alpha_\nu \geq \alpha_\mu + 1$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_\nu &= \beth_{5\alpha_\nu + 1}(|S| + \mu) \\ &\geq \beth_{5(\alpha_\eta + 1) + 1}(|S| + \mu) \\ &= \beth_5(\mu_\eta) \\ &\geq \beth_3(\mu_\eta)^{++} \\ &= \lambda^+_\eta \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

let $T := \mathrm{ds}(\lambda^+_{\langle\rangle})$, we will show that T is as required. Obviously T meets requirement $(*)_2$, and let $c : [T]^{<\aleph_0} \to \mu$. Because of the many details in the following construction we bring it as a separate lemma.

Lemma 0.18. *For* $\eta \in S$ *we can choose* M_η, T^*_η *and* $\nu_{\eta,n} \in T$ *for* $n < \omega$ *with the following properties:*

1. M_η *is an* $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_\eta, \mu^+_\eta}$*-elementary submodel of* $\mathbf{B} = (\mathcal{H}(\chi), \in, <^*_\chi)$.
2. $\|M_\eta\| = 2^{\mu_\eta}$.
3. $S, T, c \in M_\eta$.
4. $M_\rho, \nu_{\rho,n} \in M_\eta$ *for* $\rho <^*_{\ell x} \eta$, $n < \omega$.
5. *Properties of* T^*_η*:*
   - (a) $T^*_\eta = \nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)}{}^\frown T'$ *where* T' *is isomorphic to* $\mathrm{ds}(2^{2^{\mu_\eta}})$.
   - (b) *If* $\nu', \nu'' \in T^*_\eta$ *and are of the same length then they realize the same* $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_\eta, \mu^+_\eta}$*-type over* M_η.

6 Properties of the $\nu_{\eta,n}$*:*

(a) $\nu_{\eta,n} \in T$ *is of length* n*.*

(b) $\nu_{\eta,\mathrm{lg}(\eta)} \in M_\eta$*.*

(c) $\mathrm{lg}(\eta) = m < n \Rightarrow \nu_{\eta,n}(m) \notin M_\eta$*.*

(d) $\nu_{\eta,n} \in T^*_\eta$*, and for* $n \geq \mathrm{lg}(\eta)$ *has at least* μ_η *immediate successors in* T^*_η*.*

7 If $\eta = \eta_1{}^\frown\langle\alpha\rangle$*, then*

(a) $M_\eta, T^*_\eta, \nu_{\eta,n} \in M_{\eta_1}$ *for* $n < \omega$*.*

(b) $\nu_{\eta_1,n}, \nu_{\eta,n}$ *realize the same* $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_\eta,\mu^+_\eta}$*-type over* $\{M_\rho, \nu_{\rho,n} : n < \omega, \rho <^*_{\ell x} \eta\}$*.*

(c) $\nu_{\eta_1,n} = \nu_{\eta,n}$ *for* $n \leq \mathrm{lg}\ (\eta_1)$*.*

(d) $\nu_{\eta,n} <^*_{\ell x} \nu_{\eta_1,n}$ *for* $n = \mathrm{lg}(\eta)$*.*

(e) $\nu_{\eta,\mathrm{lg}(\eta)} = \nu_{\eta,\mathrm{lg}\eta_1}{}^\frown\langle\gamma\rangle$ *for some* γ*.*

(f) If $\eta' = \eta_1{}^\frown\langle\alpha'\rangle$ *with* $\alpha' < \alpha$ *then* $\nu_{\eta',\mathrm{lg}(\eta')} <^*_{\ell x} \nu_{\eta,\mathrm{lg}(\eta)}$*.*

Proof. We show a construction for such a choice by induction on $<^1_{\ell x}$, yes, $<^1_{\ell x}$ not $<^2_{\ell x}$.
As the induction is on $<^1_{\ell x}$ the base of the induction is the case $\eta = \langle\rangle$. First choose $M_{\langle\rangle} \prec_{\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_{\langle\rangle},\mu^+_{\langle\rangle}}} \mathbf{B}$ of cardinality $2^{\mu_{\langle\rangle}}$, so that $S, T, c \in M_{\langle\rangle}$ (this can be done, see Remark 0.12). The number of $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_{\langle\rangle},\mu^+_{\langle\rangle}}$ formulas $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a})$ where $\bar{a} \subseteq {}^{\mu^+_{\langle\rangle}>}M_{\langle\rangle}$ (sequences of length $< \mu^+_{\langle\rangle}$ in $M_{\langle\rangle}$) is $\leq (2^{\mu_{\langle\rangle}})^{\mu_{\langle\rangle}} = 2^{\mu_{\langle\rangle}}$ hence the number of $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_{\langle\rangle},\mu^+_{\langle\rangle}}$-types over $M_{\langle\rangle}$ is at most $\mu' = 2^{2^{\mu_{\langle\rangle}}}$, so we colour $T = \mathrm{ds}(\lambda^+_{\langle\rangle})$ by $\leq \mu'$ colours, $c_{\langle\rangle} : T \to \mu'$, so that for $\rho \in T$ its colour, $c_{\langle\rangle}(\rho)$, codes the $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_{\langle\rangle},\mu^+_{\langle\rangle}}$-type which ρ realizes in $\mathbf{B}$ over $M_{\langle\rangle}$. As

$$((\beth_2(\mu_{\langle\rangle}))^{\mu'^{\aleph_0}})^+ = \beth_3(\mu_{\langle\rangle})^+ = \lambda_{\langle\rangle}$$

by Theorem 0.10 there is an embedding of $\mathrm{ds}(\beth_2(\mu_{\langle\rangle}))$ in T, and define $T^*_{\langle\rangle}$ to be its image, so that types of sequences from $T^*_{\langle\rangle}$ depend only on their length. We choose representatives $\langle\nu_{\langle\rangle,n} : 0 < n < \omega\rangle$ from each level larger than 0 so that for $n > 0$ $\nu_{\langle\rangle,n}$ and has at least $\mu_{\langle\rangle}$ immediate successors in $T^*_{\langle\rangle}$ and satisfies $6(c)$. The latter can be done by cardinality considerations, $\|M_{\langle\rangle}\| = 2^{\mu_{\langle\rangle}}$, while the cardinality of levels in $T^*_{\eta_{\langle\rangle}}$ is $\beth_2(\mu_{\langle\rangle})$. We let $\nu_{\langle\rangle,0} = \langle\rangle$.
It is easily verified that for $\eta = \langle\rangle$ all the requirements of the construction are met.
We now show the induction step.
Assume $\eta = \eta_1{}^\frown\langle\alpha_1\rangle$, $\mathrm{lg}(\eta_1) = r$, and that we have defined for η_1 (and below by $<^1_{\ell x}$) and we define for η.

$\circledast_1$ Let $A_\eta = \{M_\rho, \nu_{\rho,n} : n < \omega, \rho <^*_{\ell x} \eta\}$.

For any $\rho <^*_{\ell x} \eta$ if $\rho = \eta_1{}^\frown\langle\alpha\rangle$ for some $\alpha < \alpha_1$ then from requirement $(7)(a)$ of the construction for ρ we have $M_\rho \in M_{\eta_1}$, and also for all $n < \omega$ $\nu_{\rho,n} \in M_{\eta_1}$, else $\rho <^*_{\ell x} \eta_1$ therefore from requirement (4) of the construction for η_1 we have for all $n < \omega$ $\nu_{\rho,n} \in M_{\eta_1}$, and $M_\rho \in M_{\eta_1}$. So $A_\eta \subseteq M_{\eta_1}$, and $|A_\eta| \leq \mu_{\eta_1}$, so A_η is definable by an $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_{\eta_1},\mu^+_{\eta_1}}$-formula with parameters in M_{η_1}, so we have:

$\circledast_2$ $A_\eta \subseteq M_{\eta_1}, |A_\eta| \leq \mu_\eta \leq \mu_{\eta_1}$, therefore $A_\eta \in M_{\eta_1}$.

For every $n < \omega$ let

$\circledast_3$ $\varphi_n(x) = \varphi_{\mu_{\eta_1},n}(x) = \bigwedge($ the $\mathbb{L}_{\mu_\eta^+,\mu_\eta^+} -$ type which $\nu_{\eta_1,n}$ realizes over $A_\eta)$

And let

$\circledast_4$ $T_\varphi = \{\rho \in T : \mathbf{B} \models \varphi_{\lg(\rho)}(\rho)\}$.

As the cardinality of the $\mathbb{L}_{\mu_\eta^+,\mu_\eta^+}$-type of any $\nu \in \mathbf{B}$ over A_η is at most 2^{μ_η} which is less than μ_{η_1}, for every $n < \omega$ we have that φ_n is an $\mathbb{L}_{\mu_{\eta_1}^+,\mu_{\eta_1}^+}$-formula and therefore T_φ is definable in $M_{\mu_{\eta_1}}$ by an $\mathbb{L}_{\mu_{\eta_1}^+,\mu_{\eta_1}^+}$-formula, namely

$$\rho \in T_\varphi \leftrightarrow \Big(\rho \in T \wedge \big(\bigvee_{n<\omega} (\lg(\rho) = n \wedge \varphi_n(\rho))\big)\Big)$$

So

$\circledast_5$ $T_\varphi \in M_{\eta_1}$ and for every $n < \omega$ we obviously have $\nu_{\eta_1,n} \in T_\varphi$.

Recall that for all $n < \omega$ $\nu_{\eta_1,n} \in T^*_{\eta_1}$, so for any $\rho \in T^*_{\eta_1}$ of length n, we have that ρ realizes the same $\mathbb{L}_{\mu_{\eta_1}^+,\mu_{\eta_1}^+}$-type over M_{η_1} as $\nu_{\eta_1,n}$ so in particular they realize the same $\mathbb{L}_{\mu_\eta^+,\mu_\eta^+}$-type over A_η, so $\rho \in T_\varphi$. For $m \geq n$ $\nu_{\eta_1,n}, \nu_{\eta_1,m}{\restriction}n$ are of the same length, so in particular $\varphi_m(x) \vdash \varphi_n(x{\restriction}n)$. If $\rho \in T_\varphi$, $\lg\rho = m$ so $\mathbf{B} \models \varphi_m(\rho)$ therefore $\mathbf{B} \models \varphi_n(\rho{\restriction}n)$ and therefore also $\rho{\restriction}n \in T_\varphi$. We summarize:

$\circledast_6$ T_φ is a subtree of T and $T^*_{\eta_1} \subseteq T_\varphi$.

The following point is a crucial one, we show that:

$\circledast_7$ $\mathrm{rk}_{T_\varphi,\mu_{\eta_1}}(\nu_{\eta_1,n}) > \mu_{\eta_1}$ for every n such that $\lg(\eta_1) \leq n < \omega$.

Assume toward contradiction that $\mathrm{rk}_{T_\varphi,\mu_{\eta_1}}(\nu_{\eta,m}) \leq \mu_{\eta_1}$ for some $\lg(\eta_1) \leq m < \omega$, and define for each n such that $m \leq n < \omega$:

$$\gamma_n = \mathrm{rk}_{T_\varphi,\mu_{\eta_1}}(\nu_{\eta,n}) \text{ and } \gamma^*_n = \mathrm{rk}^{\mu_{\eta_1}}_{T_\varphi,\mu_{\eta_1}}(\nu_{\eta_1,n})$$

(see Definitions 0.7 and 0.8). We now prove by induction on $n \geq m$ that $\gamma_{n+1} \leq \mu_{\eta_1}$, i.e $\gamma_n = \gamma^*_n$. For $n = m$ this is our assumption, and assume that it is known for n. The following can be expressed by $\mathbb{L}_{\mu_{\eta_1}^+,\mu_{\eta_1}^+}$-formulas with parameters in M_{η_1} :

ψ_1 : 'x has $\mathrm{rk}^{\mu_{\eta_1}}_{T_\varphi,\mu_{\eta_1}}(x) = \gamma_n$'

ψ_2 : 'x has at least μ_{η_1} immediate successors y in T_φ with $\mathrm{rk}^{\mu_{\eta_1}}_{T_\varphi,\mu_{\eta_1}}(y) \geq \gamma^*_{n+1}$'

We have $\mathbf{B} \models \psi_1(\nu_{\eta_1,n})$, and since $T^*_{\eta_1} \subset T_\varphi$ (see $\circledast_6$) we also have $\mathbf{B} \models \psi_2(\nu_{\eta_1,n})$. By the induction hypothesis for η_1 we have $\nu_{\eta_1,n}, \nu_{\eta_1,n+1}{\restriction}n \in T^*_{\eta_1}$ and as they are the same length realize the same $\mathbb{L}_{\mu_{\eta_1}^+,\mu_{\eta_1}^+}$-type over M_{η_1}, so $\mathbf{B} \models \psi_1 \wedge \psi_2(\nu_{\eta_1,n+1}{\restriction}n)$, or in more detail, we have that $\mathrm{rk}^{\mu_{\eta_1}}_{T_\varphi,\mu_{\eta_1}}(\nu_{\eta_1,n+1}{\restriction}n) = \gamma_n$, i.e $\mathrm{rk}_{T_\varphi,\mu_{\eta_1}}(\nu_{\eta_1,n+1}{\restriction}n) = \gamma_n$, and $\nu_{\eta_1,n+1}{\restriction}n$ has at least μ_{η_1} immediate successors in T_φ with reduced rank γ^*_{n+1}, so by the definition of rank (Definition 0.7) we have $\gamma_n > \gamma^*_{n+1}$. By the induction hypothesis $\gamma_n \leq \mu_{\eta_1}$, therefore also $\gamma^*_{n+1} = \gamma_{n+1}$. In particular we can deduce that $\gamma_{n+1} < \gamma_n$, so having carried out the induction we have an infinite decreasing sequence of ordinals which is a contradiction.

Recall that $\lg(\eta_1) = r$ so $\lg(\eta) = r + 1$,

$\circledast_8$ Define $\nu_{\eta,\ell} = \nu_{\eta_1,\ell}$ for $\ell \leq r$.

By 0.17 $\mu_{\eta_1} \geq \lambda_\eta^+$, by $\circledast_7$ $\mathrm{rk}_{T_\varphi,\mu_{\eta_1}}(\nu_{\eta_1,r}) > \mu_{\eta_1}$ therefore $\mathrm{rk}_{T_\varphi,\mu_{\eta_1}}(\nu_{\eta_1,r}) > \lambda_\eta^+$ so by definition there are $\nu \in \mathrm{Suc}_T(\nu_{\eta_1,r}) \cap T_\varphi$ satisfying $\mathrm{rk}_{T_\varphi,\mu_{\eta_1}}(\nu) \geq \lambda_\eta^+$, defining $\nu_{\eta,r+1}$ to be one such ν which is minimal with respect to $<^1_{\ell x}$ (this is equivalent to demanding that $\nu(r)$ is minimal) can be done by an $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_{\eta_1},\mu^+_{\eta_1}}$ formula. We therefore conclude:

$\circledast_9$ We can choose $\nu_{\eta,r+1} \in \mathrm{Suc}_T(\nu_{\eta_1,r}) \cap T_\varphi \cap M_{\eta_1}$ such that

(i) $\mathrm{rk}_{T_\varphi,\mu_{\eta_1}}(\nu_{\eta,r+1}) \geq \lambda_\eta^+$.

(ii) $\nu_{\eta,r+1}$ is minimal under (i) in $<^1_{\ell x}$.

As $\nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)} \in M_{\eta_1}$*and* $\nu_{\eta_1,\lg(\eta)}(\lg(\eta_1)) \notin M_{\eta_1}$, we have:

$\circledast_{10}$ $\nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)} <^1_{\ell x} \nu_{\eta_1,\lg(\eta)}$, notice that as they are the same length $<^1_{\ell x} \Rightarrow <^*_{\ell x}$.

Now for any $\rho = \eta_1{}^\frown\langle\alpha\rangle \in S$ where $\alpha < \alpha_1$ we have that $\rho <^*_{\ell x} \eta$ and therefore $\nu_{\rho,r+1} \in A_\eta$ (see $\circledast_1$). $\nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)}, \nu_{\eta_1,\lg(\eta)}$ realize the same $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_\eta,\mu^+_\eta}$-type over A_η, and by requirement $(7)(d)$ of the construction for ρ ($\lg(\rho) = \lg(\eta)$) we have $\nu_{\rho,\lg(\eta)} <^1_{\ell x} \nu_{\eta_1,\lg(\eta)}$ so also $\nu_{\rho,\lg(\eta)} <^1_{\ell x} \nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)}$ and as above, as they are the same length $<^1_{\ell x} \Rightarrow <^*_{\ell x}$, and we therefore conclude that:

$\circledast_{11}$ If $\rho = \eta_1{}^\frown\langle\alpha\rangle \in S$ where $\alpha < \alpha_1$ then $\nu_{\rho,\lg(\eta)} <^*_{\ell x} \nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)}$.

Since $|\{S, t, c, \nu_{\eta_{\lg(\eta)}}\} \cup A_\eta| < 2^{\mu_\eta}$ by Remark 0.12 we can choose M_η so that

$\circledast_{12}$ $M_\eta \prec_{\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_\eta,\mu^+_\eta}} M_{\eta_1}$, and therefore also $M_\eta \prec_{\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_\eta,\mu^+_\eta}} \mathbf{B}$, of cardinality 2^{μ_η} and $\{S, t, c, \nu_{\eta_{\lg(\eta)}}\} \cup A_\eta \subseteq M_\eta$.

By the same remark we can conclude that

$\circledast_{13}$ $M_\eta \in M_{\eta_1}$.

Lastly we choose T^*_η and $\nu_{\eta,m}$ for $m > \lg(\eta)$.
We have already commented that $\mathrm{rk}_{T_\varphi,\mu_{\eta_1}}(\nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)}) > \lambda^+_\eta$, so from Observation 0.9 we can embed $\nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)}{}^\frown\mathrm{ds}(\lambda^+_\eta)$ into T_φ so that $\rho \mapsto \rho$ for $\rho \trianglelefteq \nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)}$, and denote one such embedding by ψ, without loss of generality $\psi \in M_{\eta_1}$.
The number of $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_\eta,\mu^+_\eta}$-types over M_η is at most $\mu' = 2^{2^{\mu_\eta}}$. We colour $\mathrm{ds}(\lambda^+_\eta)$ in $\leq \mu'$ colours, the colour of $\rho \in \mathrm{ds}(\lambda^+_\eta)$ is determined by the $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_\eta,\mu^+_\eta}$-type which $\psi(\nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)}{}^\frown\rho)$ realizes over M_η, call this colouring c_η. As $((\beth_2(\mu_\eta))^{\mu'^{\aleph_0}})^+ = \beth_3(\mu_\eta)^+ = \lambda_\eta$, we can use 0.10 to get an embedding θ of $\mathrm{ds}(\beth_2(\mu_\eta))$ into $\mathrm{ds}(\lambda^+_\eta)$ so that for $\rho \in \mathrm{ds}(\beth_2(\mu_\eta))$ the $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_\eta,\mu^+_\eta}$-type that $\nu_{\eta,n+1}{}^\frown\theta(\rho)$ realizes over M_η depends only on its length. Since the set X of $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_\eta,\mu^+_\eta}$-types over M_η is in M_{η_1} of cardinality at most $\mu' < \mu_{\eta_1}$ we have $X \subset M_{\eta_1}$, also $\mathrm{ds}(\lambda^+_\eta) \in M_{\eta_1}$ so $c_\eta \in M_{\eta_1}$ and therefore without loss of generality $\theta \in M_{\eta_1}$. We define

$\circledast_{14}$ $T^*_\eta = \nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)}{}^\frown\theta\big(\mathrm{ds}(\beth_2(\mu_\eta))\big)$.

$T^*_\eta \in M_{\eta_1}$ and meets requirement (5) of the construction. We will now choose representatives $\langle \rho_m : 0 < m < \omega \rangle$ from each level of $\mathrm{ds}(\beth_2(\mu_\eta))$ so that $\nu_{\eta,n+1}{}^\frown\theta(\rho_m)$ has at least μ_η immediate successors in T^*_η and $\nu_{\eta,n+1}{}^\frown\theta(\rho_m)(\lg(\eta)) \notin M_{\eta_1}$, since the existence of such representatives in $\mathbf{B}$ can be expressed by an $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_{\eta_1},\mu^+_{\eta_1}}$-formula with parameters in M_{η_1} so without loss of generality $\rho_m \in M_{\eta_1}$ and define

$\circledast_{15}$ $\nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)+m} = \nu_{\eta,n+1}{}^\frown\theta(\rho_m)$.

T^*_η is a subtree of T_φ therefore $\rho \in T^*_\eta$ realizes the same $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_\eta,\mu^+_\eta}$type over A_η as $\nu_{\eta_1,\lg(\rho)}$. The $\nu_{\eta,n}$ for $n > \lg(\eta)$ were chosen to satisfy $(6)(c)$-(d) so in particular they are in T_φ, and therefore realize the same $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_\eta,\mu^+_\eta}$-type over A_η as $\nu_{\eta_1,n}$. By the induction hypothesis we have already constructed for η_1 so for all n we have $\lg(\nu_{\eta,n}) = \lg(\nu_{\eta_1,n}) = n$ so also $(6)(a)$ is satisfied. Requirements (1)-(4) and $(6)(b)$ of the construction are taken care of by $\circledast_{12}$. $\circledast_7$-$\circledast_{11}$, $\circledast_{13}$ and $\circledast_{15}$ guarantee requirement (7). $\square$

All that is left in order to complete the proof of the claim is to show that $\{\nu_{\eta,\lg(\eta)} : \eta \in S\}$ is end-uniform with respect to c.
Let $\eta_1 <^2_{\ell x} \eta_2 <^2_{\ell x} \ldots <^2_{\ell x} \eta_k <^2_{\ell x} \rho', \rho''$, be as in 0.15(2); without loss of generality $\rho' <^*_{\ell x} \rho''$. Let $t = \lg(\rho' \cap \rho'')$, $\mu' = \mu^+_{\rho'}$ and $A = \{\nu_{\rho,\lg\rho} : \rho <^*_{\ell x} \rho' {\restriction} (t+1)\}$.
We first show that for every $i \leq k$ $\eta_i <^*_{\ell x} \rho' {\restriction} (t+1)$ so that $\nu_{\eta_i.\lg(\eta_i)} \in A$. As $\eta_i <^2_{\ell x} \rho'$ and $\lg(\eta_i \cap \rho'') = \lg(\eta_i \cap \rho')$ so $\rho' \ntrianglelefteq \eta_i$, therefore there is ℓ_i such that $\eta_i {\restriction} \ell_i = \rho' {\restriction} \ell_i$ and $\eta_i(\ell_i) < \rho'(\ell_i)$, but then $\eta_i {\restriction} \ell_i = \rho'' {\restriction} \ell_i$ i.e $\rho' {\restriction} \ell_i = \rho'' {\restriction} \ell_i$ so $\ell_i \leq t$ (and $\eta_i(\ell_i) < \rho''(\ell_i)$) and $\eta_i <^*_{\ell x} \rho' {\restriction} (t+1)$.
We now prove by induction on $\ell \in [t, \lg(\rho')]$ that $\nu_{\rho'{\restriction}\ell,\lg\rho'}$ and $\nu_{\rho'{\restriction}t,\lg\rho'}$ realize the same $\mathbb{L}_{\mu',\mu'}$-type over A. For $\ell = t$ this is obvious. Let us assume correctness for ℓ and prove for $\ell + 1$. For every $n < \omega$ by $(7)(b)$ of the construction $\nu_{\rho'{\restriction}\ell,n}, \nu_{\rho'{\restriction}(\ell+1),n}$ realize the same $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_{\rho'{\restriction}(\ell+1)},\mu^+_{\rho'{\restriction}(\ell+1)}}$-type over $\{M_\rho, \nu_{\rho,n} : \rho <^*_{\ell x} \rho' {\restriction} (\ell+1)\}$ and in particular over A, for if $\rho <^*_{\ell x} \rho' {\restriction} (t+1)$ then also $\rho <^*_{\ell x} \rho' {\restriction} (\ell+1)$. So $\nu_{\rho'{\restriction}\ell,\lg\rho'}, \nu_{\rho'{\restriction}(\ell+1),\lg\rho}$ realize the same $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_{\rho'{\restriction}(\ell+1)},\mu^+_{\rho'{\restriction}(\ell+1)}}$-type so also the same $\mathbb{L}_{\mu',\mu'}$-type over A, and from the induction hypothesis $\nu_{\rho'{\restriction}t,\lg\rho'}$ and $\nu_{\rho'{\restriction}\ell,\lg\rho'}$ realize the same $\mathbb{L}_{\mu',\mu'}$-type over A. Similarly we show for ρ'', so $\nu_{\rho',\lg\rho'}$ and $\nu_{\rho'',\lg\rho''}$ realize the same $\mathbb{L}_{\mu^+_{\eta_1},\mu^+_{\eta_1}}$-type over A.
From the above we can deduce that in particular

$$c(\langle \nu_{\eta_1,\lg(\eta_1)}, \ldots, \nu_{\eta_k,\lg(\eta_k)}, \nu_{\rho',\lg(\rho')} \rangle) = c(\langle \nu_{\eta_1,\lg(\eta_1)}, \ldots, \nu_{\eta_k,\lg(\eta_k)}, \nu_{\rho'',\lg(\rho'')} \rangle).$$

$\square$

Conclusion 0.19. *Given a tree $S \subseteq \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ and $n(*) < \omega$ and μ we can find a tree $T \subseteq \mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ such that:*

- $(*)_1$ *For every $c : [T]^{<\aleph_0} \to \mu$ there is $S' \subseteq T$ isomorphic to S such that S' is $n(*)$-end-uniform for c.*
- $(*)_2$ *In particular, for every $c : [T]^{n(*)} \to \mu$ is $S' \subseteq T$ isomorphic to S such that $c{\restriction}S'$ depends only on the equivalence classes of the equivalence relation defined in 0.13.*
- $(*)_3$ $|T| < \beth_{1,n(*)}(|S|, \mu)$ *(see Definition 0.20 below).*

Proof. Let S, μ be as above. Since for $|S|, \mu \geq \aleph_0$ we have that $\beth_{1,n(*)}(|S|, \mu^{\aleph_0}) = \beth_{1,n(*)}(|S|, \mu)$, replacing μ with $\mu^{\aleph_0}$ gives the same bound, and we can therefore assume that $\mu = \mu^{\aleph_0}$.
Let $\langle h_n : n < \omega \rangle$ be the equivalence classes of the similarity relationship on finite sequences of $\mathrm{ds}(\infty)$ (see 0.14(1)), and let $f : {}^{\omega}(\mu \cup \{-1\}) \to \mu$ be one-to-one and onto.
We construct by induction a sequence $\langle T_n : n < \omega \rangle$ so that $T_0 = S$, and for every $n > 0$:

(a) $|T_n| < \beth_{1,n}(|S|, \mu)$

(b) T_{n-1}, T_n, μ correspond to S, T, μ in Theorem 0.16.

(c) For every $c : [T_n]^{<\aleph_0} \to \mu$ there is $S' \subseteq T_n$ isomorphic to S such that S' is n-end-uniform for c.

By Theorem 0.16 we can obviously construct such a sequence satisfying clauses (a), (b), We will show by induction on n that for this sequence also clause (c) holds. For $n = 1$ this is Theorem 0.16. Assume correctness for n and let $c : [T_{n+1}]^{<\aleph_0} \to \mu$. By ($b$) there is $T' \subseteq T_{n+1}$ isomorphic to T_n so that T' is end-uniform for c. Let $\varphi : T_n \to T'$ be an isomorphism and let $d : [T']^{<\aleph_0} \to {}^{\omega}(\mu \cup \{-1\})$ as follows: for $\bar{\rho} = \langle \rho_1 \dots \rho_k \rangle$ where $\rho_1 <^2_{\ell x} \rho_2 <^2_{\ell x} \dots <^2_{\ell x} \rho_k$ and $m < \omega$

$$d(\bar{\rho})(m) = \begin{cases} c(\bar{\rho}^\frown\langle\eta\rangle) & \text{if } \bar{\rho}^\frown\langle\eta\rangle \in h_m \text{ for some } \eta \\ \text{-1} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

d is well defined as T' is end-uniform for c, and by defining $\varphi(\rho_1, \dots \rho_k) = (\varphi(\rho_1), \dots \varphi(\rho_k))$ for $\rho_1, \dots \rho_k \in T_n$ we have $f \circ d \circ \varphi : [T_n]^{<\aleph_0} \to \mu$, so by the induction hypothesis there is $T'' \subseteq T_n$ isomorphic to S so that T'' is n-end-uniform for $f \circ d \circ \varphi$. We claim that $S' = \varphi(T'')$ is isomorphic to S and that S' is $n+1$-end-uniform for c. As T'' is isomorphic to S and φ is an isomorphism S' is obviously isomorphic to S. Let the following sequences in S' be similar,

$$\eta_1 <^2_{\ell x}< \eta_2 <^2_{\ell x} \dots <^2_{\ell x} \eta_k <^2_{\ell x} \rho'_1 <^2_{\ell x} \dots <^2_{\ell x} \rho'_{n+1}$$

$$\eta_1 <^2_{\ell x}< \eta_2 <^2_{\ell x} \dots <^2_{\ell x} \eta_k <^2_{\ell x} \rho''_1 <^2_{\ell x}< \dots < \rho''_{n+1}$$

So in T'' the following sequences are similar:

$$\varphi^{-1}(\eta_1 \dots \rho'_1 \dots \rho'_n) = (\varphi^{-1}(\eta_1)\varphi^{-1}(\rho'_1) \dots \varphi^{-1}(\rho'_n))$$

$$\varphi^{-1}(\eta_1 \dots \rho''_1 \dots \rho''_n) = (\varphi^{-1}(\eta_1)\varphi^{-1}(\rho''_1) \dots \varphi^{-1}(\rho''_n))$$

so $f \circ d \circ \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\eta_1 \dots \eta_k, \rho'_1 \dots \rho'_n)) = f \circ d \circ \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\eta_1 \dots \eta_k, \rho''_1 \dots \rho''_n))$. Therefore we have $f(d(\eta_1 \dots \eta_k, \rho'_1 \dots \rho'_n)) = f(d(\eta_1 \dots \eta_k, \rho''_1 \dots \rho''_n))$, and as f is one-to-one, $d(\eta_1 \dots \eta_k, \rho'_1 \dots \rho'_n) = d(\eta_1 \dots \eta_k, \rho''_1 \dots \rho''_n)$, and therefore $c(\eta_1 \dots \eta_k, \rho'_1 \dots \rho'_{n+1}) = c(\eta_1 \dots \eta_k, \rho''_1 \dots \rho''_{n+1})$, and $(*)_1$-$(*)_3$ are easily verified. $\square$

Definition 0.20. *For cardinals* $\lambda \geq \aleph_0$ *and* μ *define* $\beth_{1,\alpha}(\lambda, \mu)$ *by induction on* α. $\beth_{1,0}(\lambda, \mu) = \beth_0(\lambda) = \lambda$, $\beth_{1,\alpha+1}(\lambda, \mu) = \beth_{\beth_{1,\alpha}(\lambda,\mu)^+}(\beth_{1,\alpha}(\lambda, \mu) + \mu)$, *and for a limit ordinal* α $\beth_{1,\alpha}(\lambda, \mu) = \sum\limits_{\beta < \alpha} \beth_{1,\beta}(\lambda, \mu)$.

We end with a conclusion for scattered order types.

Conclusion 0.21. *For a scattered order type* φ*, a cardinal* μ *and* $n < \omega$*, there is a scattered order type* ψ *so that* $\psi \to (\varphi)^n_{\mu,\aleph_0}$.

Proof. Given a scattered order type φ, a cardinal μ and $n < \omega$ by Observation 0.4(3) we can embed φ in $(\mathrm{ds}(\alpha), <^3)$ for some ordinal α. By Conclusion 0.19$(*)_2$ above there is an ordinal λ and a tree $T \subset \mathrm{ds}(\lambda)$ so that for every colouring $c : T^n \to \mu$ there is a subtree $S \subseteq T$ isomorphic to $\mathrm{ds}(\alpha)$ so that $c \restriction S$ depends only on the equivalence class of similarity. Noting the above Observation, as $(T, <^3)$ is a scattered order, and as there are only $\aleph_0$ equivalence classes, we are done. $\square$

References

[1] M. A. Dickman, *Larger infinitary languages*, Model Theoretic Logics (J. Barwise and S. Feferman, eds.), Perspectives in Mathematical Logic, Springer-Verlag, New York Berlin Heidelberg Tokyo, 1985, pp. 317–364.

[2] F. Hausdorff, *Grundzüge einer Theorie der geordneten Mengen*, Math. Ann. **65** (1908), no. 4, 435–505. MR MR1511478

[3] Péter Komjáth and Saharon Shelah, *A partition theorem for scattered order types*, Combinatorics Probability and Computing **12** (2003, no.5-6), 621–626, Special issue on Ramsey theory. math.LO/0212022.

[4] Joseph G. Rosenstein, *Linear orderings*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, vol. 98, Academic Press Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers], New York, 1982. MR MR662564 (84m:06001)